

REMARKS

Claims 1-35, 38-44 were pending as of the action mailed February 7, 2007.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation from claim 40. Claim 24 has been amended to incorporate the limitation from claim 28. Claim 30 has been amended to incorporate the limitation from claim 34. Claims 5, 28, 34, and 40 have been cancelled.

Claim 38 has been amended. Support for the amendment is found in at least claims 2-3 as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

§ 101 REJECTIONS

Claim 24 and its dependent claims were rejected because the term “information carrier” includes a “propagated signal.” To expedite prosecution and without prejudice, the applicant has amended claim 24 to replace “information carrier” with “machine-readable storage device.”

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-35, 38-44 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Azami (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064481) in view of Lindblad (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0103105). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 24, 30. Claims 1, 24, 30 have been amended to include the limitation from claims 40, 28, and 34, respectively, which recites “associating multiple fragments with a particular object in the content management system.”

The examiner asserts that Azami teaches this feature, citing Azami's teaching of an ID uniquely identifying a fragment. Azami, paragraphs 0067-0068. The examiner equates the ID with the recited object. Assuming for the sake of argument that the examiner's equivalence of the ID with the recited object is correct, the cited sections of Azami actually teaches the opposite of the recited feature. As described in paragraph 0067 of Azami, the ID uniquely identifies a fragment. This implies that IDs and fragments are associated on a one-to-one basis. Association of multiple fragments with a particular ID would defeat the purpose of the ID (unique

identification of a fragment). Thus, the examiner has not shown that Azami teaches the recited feature. Lindblad has not been shown to remedy this deficiency.

For at least the reasons stated above, the combination of Azami and Lindblad does not render claims 1, 24, and 30 obvious. Therefore, claims 1, 24, and 30 should be allowed.

Other claims. The other pending claims depend from claims 1, 24, or 30, and are allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying or conceding that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any charges not otherwise paid and any credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 7, 2007

Andrew Leung
Andrew H. Leung
Reg. No. 55,374

Customer No. 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071